REMARKS

I. Status of Claims

After the above amendments, claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 10, and 16 are independent.

Claims 1-3 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0142174 to Boyd et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0066433 to Pingrey et al. Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Boyd et al. publication as modified by the Pingrey et al. publication in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0032468 to Killmeier et al. Finally, claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Boyd et al. publication as modified by the Pingrey et al. publication in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,975,687 to Powers.

Applicants have carefully reviewed the rejections, and respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claim 1, as amended, now recites, among other things, "a housing comprising a receiving part formed at one side of the bottom thereof to receive and fix the print head unit therein, the receiving part having an ink feed hole including a dam on its perimeter to support the head chip, and a separate secondary dam of the same height as the dam which also supports the head chip, and an ink chamber disposed therein." One embodiment of these features can be seen at, for example, Figures 5A and 5B. As seen there, a receiving part 50 has ink feed hole 17. A dam 17a is formed around the perimeter of the ink feed hole 17. Additionally, a pair of secondary dams 55 are formed on the receiving part 50. The dam 17a and the secondary dams 55 are the same height as one another. Furthermore, the dam 17a and the secondary dams 55 are separated from one another.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of the Boyd et al. publication and the Pingrey et al. publication. Neither of these references, however, alone or in combination, suggests a dam surrounding an ink feed hole 17a and a separate secondary dam 55. In the Office Action, the Examiner recognizes that the Boyd et al. publication does not disclose an ink feed hole including a dam on its circumference to support the head chip, and a secondary

dam of the same height as the dam which also supports the head chip, and an ink chamber disposed therein. The Examiner asserts, however, that the Pingrey et al. publication discloses these features, and that it would have been obvious to incorporate these features into the Boyd et al. patent.

The Pingrey et al. publication does not disclose two separate dams, as required by independent claim 1. As seen in Fig. 2 of the Pingrey et al. publication, there is one dam 96 that surrounds an ink feed hole 102. Fig. 5 shows a cross-section of the dam 96 and the ink feed hole 102. Since Fig. 5 is just a cross-section of Fig. 2, Fig. 5 only shows one dam, and does not show two, separate dams, as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, neither the Killmeier et al. publication (which was cited is support of the rejections of claims 4-6), nor the Powers patent (which was cited in support of the rejection of claim 9), discloses or suggests two separate dams as claimed in the present claims.

Thus, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, either alone or in any permissible combination, and is allowable.

III. New Claims 10-20

Applicant has added new claims 10-20 to cover additional features of the present invention. Independent claim 10 requires, among other things, "a housing comprising a receiving part for receiving the print head unit, the receiving part having an ink feed hole for supplying ink to the print head unit, a first dam formed around the perimeter of the ink feed hole for supporting the head chip, and at least one secondary dam of the same height as the first dam for supporting the head chip, wherein the at least one secondary dam is spaced away from the first dam." As discussed above, the alleged dam and secondary dam of the Pingrey et al. publication are, in fact, the same dam. Accordingly, the alleged secondary is not spaced away from the first dam. Accordingly, independent claim 10, and its dependent claims, are allowable.

Independent claim 16 requires both "a first dam protruding outwardly from the bottom of the receiving part" and "at least one secondary dam protruding outwardly from the bottom of the receiving part for supporting the head chip." As seen in, for example, Fig. 5 of the Boyd et al. reference, the alleged dam of that reference does not protrude outwardly from the bottom of the receiving part. Similarly, as seen in Fig. 5 of the Pingrey et al. publication, the alleged dam of that reference does not protrude outwardly from the bottom of the receiving part. Accordingly,

neither reference discloses or suggests "a first dam protruding outwardly from the bottom of the receiving part" and "at least one secondary dam protruding outwardly from the bottom of the receiving part for supporting the head chip," as required by independent claim 16. Accordingly, independent claim 16, and its dependent claims, are allowable.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 5, 2006

Michael E. Stimson
Reg. No. 41, 333
Attorney for Applicant

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680
Main: (202) 659-9076
Direct: (202)530-7372